Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the Minutes from April 9, 2014
3. 1460/Intellectual Property
4. Concerns Surrounding Multiple PIs in eGC1
5. Possible Revisions to GiM19: Policy Document about Proposal Submission Deadlines and Waivers
6. UW Accreditation Task Force: University-level Research Goals
7. Adjourn

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Miller at 9:00 a.m.

2) Approval of the Minutes from April 9, 2014

The minutes from April 9, 2014 were approved as written.

3) 1460/Intellectual Property

Miller reported on recent developments surrounding intellectual property and the Outside Work Form. IPMAC and SCIPC have been discussing the issue regarding new “present assignment” language in the Outside Work Form and have agreed on an interim version. Miller reported that the Senate Executive Committee considered moving SCIPC under FCR as a subcommittee but decided to wait another year to determine if any new issues have arisen.

4) Concerns Surrounding Multiple PIs in EGC1

Miller discussed an email he received from a faculty member in the Evans School of Public Affairs who was concerned about the fact that the UW research grants database switched from listing a PI and multiple co-PIs on a grant. The concern relies on the difficulty to partner with other institutions and attract researches to join UW faculty due to the switch. Additionally, the faculty member is concerned that the practice may deter collaborative and cross-unit research at UW. Specially, the particular logistical challenges that faculty and staff have encountered is that there is only one PI on the eGC1 submission and they may have co-investigators, but no co-principle investigators. There is no method in the current electronic data files to get information by more than one investigator unless they create a sub-budget and put the other investigator on as a PI for that sub-budget. Evans School staff report that when they attempt to do so, they are not always successful depending upon the policies and practices of the other department. There is now a new ability in the SAGE system (egc-1s) to search by faculty name and see all the current grants in which they have a role, but the information is not yet appearing in the data warehouse where faculty can pull research reports.
Lidstrom explained there must have been a misunderstanding because UW never had the ability to list multiple PIs, but there is a new ability to review the grant database in the warehouse which may have led to the confusion. UW does wish to have the ability to list multiple PIs but is limited to an old database. Lidstrom added that updating the database would require a massive redesign that would not be completed for several years. The Office of Research has been dealing with several concerns related to collaborative work including credit tracking and indirect cost return flow. Lidstrom explained that the Office of Research is working on a policy statement regarding work involving multiple PIs and will bring it to FCR and other stakeholders to review and provide feedback. Lidstrom added that Jerry Baldasty is meeting with the Board of Deans today to discuss the importance of interdisciplinary research and education, and based on the meeting Lidstrom hopes that Board will support the efforts to improve collaborative work amongst units.

A question was raised about workarounds to list co-PIs in the database. Lidstrom stressed this would be a large administrative burden. A comment was raised expressing concern that younger faculty members are not receiving credit for their work on collaborative projects and senior researchers are being listed as the sole PI. This is a critical problem because it negatively impacts promotion and tenure. Additionally, the problem is compounded when college councils are not addressing this issue themselves. Members discussed how credit is dispersed amongst departments when there are multiple PIs on a project.

Lidstrom explained that once the Board of Deans endorses these efforts her office will develop a set of proposed recommendations and begin soliciting feedback from affected stakeholders while conducting focus groups with faculty. Lidstrom clarified that the board will be endorsing a statement about collaboration and working across administrative bodies. There does not appear to be much pushback and Lidstrom is hopeful that it will be well received. Lidstrom stressed that FCR can play an influential role in moving this issue forward. Lidstrom will report back to FCR at the June meeting and provide an update regarding this issue.

A question was raised asking if there was an official policy on how to deal with interdisciplinary programs. For example, some graduate programs are being moved around to different departments and there is dwindling confidence that certain programs will receive the funding it needs to be successful. Lidstrom explained the problem is ultimately up to the deans to solve and Dave Eaton is now reviewing polices that can guide interdisciplinary programs.

Miller will respond to the faculty member at the Evans School and report on today’s discussion.

5) Possible Revisions to GIM19: Policy Document about Proposal Submission Deadlines and Waivers

Lidstrom outlined the current procedures for obtaining deadline waivers and discussed possible revisions to the current policy. Several problematic issues have led to reviewing this policy including unreliable electronic systems and the increasing trend to submit proposal’s last minute. Lidstrom stressed that last-minute submissions is especially problematic for her office because staff are not given enough time to effectively process proposals. There is a policy to meet the required 3-day deadline but faculty are abusing the waiver criteria, often saying they are “too busy” to submit their proposals on time.

Discussion ensued. A comment was raised that collaborative projects create difficulties in submitting proposals on time because some collaborators do not respect UW’s deadlines. One possibility is to
broaden the waiver criteria to address collaborative projects. Discussion moved to limited resources available for the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) to expand staff to address last-minute proposals. Lidstrom explained that ABB provides funding directly to academic departments and stressed that additional staff would not solve the entire problem. Rather, the problem is primarily the result of proposals not being submitted on time.

A comment was raised noting the difficulty of this issue. While it is important for the OSP to have proposals submitted on time, sometimes it is not possible to have the data ready for the deadlines. A comment was raised reiterating the problem of collaborators not following UW’s deadlines. Members discussed if the problem is a result of outside collaborators, the narrative section of the proposal, or the SAGE database. Lidstrom suggested that OSP could pilot its new procedures with departments that demonstrate good behavior which can act as an incentive for other department to submit proposals on time.

A comment was raised stressing the need to keep the 3-day deadline rule. If OSP broadens its submission deadline it could likely create a slippery slope that could be abused. A comment was raised again stressing the problems created by collaborators and asked if OSP could create a waiver for collaborative projects. Discussion ensued. Lidstrom mentioned that one possible recommendation would be to assign a “floater” to handle last-minute submissions. OSP is also moving towards assigning staff who are specialized in certain areas of research to handle specific proposals due to the complexities that are involved.

Lidstrom thanked FCR for its input and will work over the summer to develop recommendations that she will present to the council at a later time.

6) UW Accreditation Task Force: University-level Research Goals

Patricia Moy (Associate Vice Provost for Academic and Student Affairs) presented on UW’s 7-year accreditation process and requested feedback to identify university-level research goals. Moy explained there are 5 standards and 24 eligibility criteria as part of the accreditation process where UW must show improvement. During Year 0 UW must identify goals and criteria to be measured, produce a progress report in Year 3, and submit a final report in Year 7. The UW Accreditation Task Force is now approaching stakeholder groups to solicit feedback on UW’s 7-year goals in order to identify the goals and criteria to be used in the accreditation process. Moy explained the focus is on three areas:

- Research and scholarship
- Teaching and learning
- Service and engagement.

Members discussed goals and priorities to be reflected in the accreditation process. A question was raised about the term “maximize institutional support”. Moy explained the term is intended to be broad and the Task Force will work to identify the particular metrics at a later stage. A suggestion was made to change the term to “maximize institutional resources to support research and creative activity” to emphasize the need to maximize funding. Members discussed the definitions of “creative activity”, “research and scholarship”, “efficiency and leanness”, “interdisciplinary” and “enhance student learning” while providing suggested revisions. A suggestion was made to differentiate “student learning experience” between graduate and undergraduate students because their experiences are not the same.
Moy explained that as part of the last accreditation cycle UW was advised to focus on a more narrow set of goals (from 17). UW will now focus on 3-4 specific areas that will be universally agreed-upon and allow for the efficient collection of data over the 7-year process.

7) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Miller at 10:20 a.m.
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